



A Decade of Advancing Patient-Centered Care:  
**The 10th National CAHPS® User Group Meeting**




## **Field Testing of the CAHPS In-Center Hemodialysis Survey**

**Beverly Weidmer Ocampo, M.A.  
RAND Corporation  
Santa Monica, CA**




**Purpose**



- To assess how well the instruments are working among a variety of hemodialysis patients in a variety of dialysis settings
- To assess different modes of survey administration

2



## Criteria for selecting facilities



- Different regions (NW/SW/NE/SE)
- Rural, urban and suburban facilities
- Small, medium and large facilities
- Dialysis organization facilities and independent facilities
- Facilities that have fielded own surveys and facilities that have not
- Facilities that meet racial/ethnic sampling targets

3



## Criteria for selecting patients



- Currently dialyzing
- In-center hemodialysis patients
- At least 3 months experience with in-center hemodialysis
- At least 3 months of experience at current facility

4



## Data Collection Approach



- **Mixed mode**
  - Advance notification letter
  - 1<sup>st</sup> mailing of survey
  - Reminder letter
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> mailing of survey
  - Telephone follow-up
- **Telephone only**
  - Advance notification letter
  - Telephone contact

5



## Data Collection Approach-continued



- **Patients who received the survey by mail could complete the survey by phone and patients who were contacted by phone could request a mail survey instead**
- **This methodology was necessary because it was anticipated that some patients would have difficulty completing a mail survey or a phone survey due to health problems (e.g., poor vision, fatigue, impaired hearing).**

6



## Overview



- 32 in-center hemodialysis facilities randomly selected
- 3,143 patients randomly selected
- Patients randomly assigned to either mixed mode or telephone only
- 1,362 patients randomly assigned to mixed mode (43%)
- 1,781 patients randomly assigned to telephone only (57%)

7



## Field Test Results



- Completed 1,358 surveys (overall response rate of 46%)
- 818 were completed by telephone
- 636 were completed by mail
- Of the completed surveys, 93% (1,358) were completed in English and the remaining 7% (96) were completed in Spanish.

8



## Field Test Results--continued



- **Among respondents randomized to the telephone mode, 695 (39%) completed the survey**
  - 655 (37%) completed the survey by phone
  - 40 (2%) completed the survey by mail
- **Among respondents randomized to the mixed mode, 759 (56%) completed the survey**
  - 596 (44%) completed the survey by mail
  - 163 (12%) completed the survey by phone

9



## Field Test Analysis Conducted



- **Psychometric analysis to assess how well individual survey items are performing**
- **Assess effectiveness of data collection modes**
- **Evaluation of Case-Mix models**
- **Modeling of Unit Non-Response and Evaluation of Non-Response Weights**
- **Evaluation of Mode Effects**

10



## Patient Follow-Up Survey



- Conducted follow-up survey with patients who reported receiving help in completing the survey
- Purpose of follow-up was to find out what kind of help they received and why
- 230 individuals reported receiving help completing the survey
- Conducted follow up interviews with 96 (92 who completed a mail survey, 4 phone interview)
- Fifty-seven of the respondents were male and 39 were female. Eighty-two had completed an English language survey and 14 a Spanish survey.

11



## Findings from Follow-Up Survey



- Most respondents reported being helped by a family member
- Most common reason for needing help was a vision problem
- Most respondents reported that they had had questions read to them and the answers written down for them
- Conclusion: bias introduced by proxy respondents for the field test data collection appears to be minimal

12



## Post Field Test....



- **August 2005: presented findings to AHRQ and CMS**
- **Sept 2005: revised instrument based on findings from field test and input from CMS**
- **October 2005: presented revised instrument to TEP**
- **November 2005: discussed revised instrument with TEP and responded to comments/concerns**

13

